

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 11-23 are allowed. Claims 4-6 are objected to. By this amendment, claim 4 is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 4-6 should now be allowed. Claims 1-3 and 7-10 are rejected and are at issue.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-3 and 7-10 as anticipated by Borland et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,724,772 and as obvious over Simmons et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,936,953 in view of Stallings "Local and Metropolitan Area Networks".

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, specifies a system for providing communication between a plurality of cores in an integrated circuit. The system comprises a circular segmented bus operatively connected to each of the cores for transferring data between the plurality of cores. Arbiter means arbitrate which of the plurality of cores can transmit data at any given time. The arbiter means dynamically segments the circular segmented bus to enable plural simultaneous data transmissions on the bus.

None of the references, alone or in any combination, disclose or suggest a circular segmented bus. Borland et al. discloses a circular, non-segmented bus. Simmons et al. discloses a linear non-segmented bus. Stallings likewise discloses a non-segmented bus. In order to clarify the distinction, claim 1 is amended herein to specify that the arbiter means dynamically segments the circular segmented bus to enable plural simultaneous data transmissions on the bus. Particularly, as described in the present application, a conventional prior art system, such as disclosed in the cited

references, limit the amount of bandwidth available for communication as only one pair of cores can communicate on a bus at the same time. Indeed, Borland et al. addresses this problem in a different manner by allocating bandwidth based on a timing value. However, Borland et al. does not use a segmented bus, as claimed herein. Neither do Simmons et al. or Stallings disclose or suggest a segmented bus. While the action uses the word "segmented" to refer to the buses in these references, there is no segmentation as each is a continuous bus, as referenced as prior art in the present application. As such, neither Borland et al. or Simmons et al. dynamically segment a bus and do not enable plural simultaneous data transmissions on a bus.

Because Borland et al. does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, arranged as in the claim, there is no anticipation and the rejection is improper. Moreover, because Borland et al. does not suggest the claimed invention, any obviousness rejection would also be improper.

Likewise, Simmons et al. does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Likewise, any combination with Stallings would still not result in the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention is not obvious over the combination of Simmons and Stallings.


Claims 2-3 and 7-10 depend from claim 2 and are allowable for the same reasons.

For the above reasons, claims 1-3 and 7-10 are believed allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance and passage to issue are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 7, 2006


F. William McLaughlin
Reg. No. 32,273

Wood, Phillips, Katz, Clark and Mortimer
Citigroup Center, Suite 3800
500 W. Madison Street
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800